



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

have been made of the important memorial issued by the authorities of London to commemorate the part of their mayor in suppressing the revolt.¹ In fact, Mr. Trevelyan does not seem to have made a sufficiently exhaustive use of the chronicle which we owe to his diligence. Its revelations on Tyler's important personal part in the negotiations at Mile End are well worthy of note, as are also the new demands of the insurgents recorded, especially one for the repeal of the statute of laborers.² Tyler's further requirements at Smithfield are equally important. Those of a religious nature provide that the goods of the clergy be seized and divided among the parishioners; that the lands and tenements of possessioners be divided among the commons of the realm; and that the hierarchy, with the exception of a single spiritual head for the Church of England, be abolished.³ Such provisions surely deserve more than a passing notice⁴ in a work of which Wiclif is the most prominent figure.

GEORGE KRIEHN.

Margaret of Denmark. By MARY HILL. (London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1898. Pp. vii, 156.)

THIS book is an attempt to give to English readers a general account of Margaret of Denmark, queen-regent of the three Scandinavian countries. Following the lead of the older authorities, Miss Hill is disposed to rank Margaret as one of the great queens of history, and even finds her worthy of comparison with Alfred the Great. Undoubtedly Margaret had some elements of greatness, but they certainly were not of the quality that excite our sympathetic admiration for Alfred. Although the opportunity was not wanting, she stood for no great idea. She might have welded the three Scandinavian countries into a mighty empire, and this is what the general student of history thinks that she did, but this empire was of the most superficial character. The union which she effected was based on the most short-sighted dynastic policy. Her main efforts were directed toward the fortification of royal authority in Denmark and the extension of her realm. In these things she was very successful under seemingly adverse circumstances, although much of her vaunted strength no doubt lies in its contrast with the weakness of opposing forces. She was, however, a crafty queen who ruled a large realm with subtle astuteness and sagacity, but not with broad-gauged wisdom. Her success was in a large measure made possible by a series of more or less accidental combinations, and by the general national impotence, and the political and social anarchy that characterized the latter half of the fourteenth century in Scandinavia.

¹ The author accepts Froissart's tale of the insolence of the insurgents toward the queen-mother in the Tower and her escape by water to the Wardrobe (p. 237). But we know from the testimony of the official city record (Riley, *Memorials of London*, 449), and from Mr. Trevelyan's own chronicle (p. 517) that she accompanied the King at Mile End. Other doubtful instances are pp. 226, 232, 244 n. 2.

² *English Historical Review*, XIII. 517.

³ *Ib.*, 519.

⁴ P. 220.

The laws of all three of the Scandinavian countries debarred a woman from wearing the crown ; but circumstances placed a sceptre in her hand, and she wielded it with such skill that from the rank of guardian to a fatherless prince, she became, after his early death, not only ruler of his domain—Denmark and Norway—but on account of her successful administration of affairs, she was invited by the dissatisfied nobility of Sweden to invade their land to assist them in expelling their incompetent king and become their sovereign. She accomplished the task, and thus became ruler of the three Scandinavian countries.

Margaret was born in 1353. Like Elizabeth of England, she was the daughter of a "coarse-fibred, firm-handed, vigorous king," Valdemar Atterdag of Denmark. He early discovered the essence of his own virility in her, and grumbled at the misfortune of her having been born a daughter. But he soon found her available on the royal chess-board. At a very early age she was given in marriage to young Haakon of Norway. Their son Olaf was in 1376 elected king of Denmark, upon the death of Valdemar. There had been much dispute over the succession, but Margaret's shrewdness seems to have turned the current of opinion toward her son. She herself was appointed regent during his minority. In 1380, through the death of his father, Olaf also fell heir to Norway ; but in 1387 he died, at the age of seventeen, whereupon Margaret became reigning queen in both Denmark and Norway.

The ease with which Margaret made herself sovereign in these two countries, where both law and custom were against her, reveals her powers of astute statesmanship. Whether from fear, or from respect for law and custom, we do not know, but Margaret immediately set about to fortify her royal position, and to insure a succession in accordance with her desires. Her only child was dead, and so she prevailed upon the powers in Norway to choose her grand-nephew, Erik of Pomerania, as her successor. A little later she saw fit to have him elected king under her guardianship. She now turned her attention to Sweden, where, with the encouragement and assistance of the nobility, she succeeded in ejecting Albrecht of Mecklenburg, whereupon, in 1396, Erik of Pomerania was elected king. The next year, on the occasion of the convention at Kalmar, he was crowned king of the united Scandinavian kingdoms, but Margaret continued to hold the reins of government until her death in 1412. She might have worn the triple crown herself, but she seems to have been content with her position as actual ruler, without the ostentatious adjunct of a crown. No doubt she had excellent reasons for her course of procedure, but they are not recorded.

Margaret is best known to the world in connection with the Union of Kalmar, which bears the date of July 20, 1397. But recent investigation has shown that the document promulgated on this occasion was entirely invalid. After having obtained a secure foothold in Sweden, she summoned representatives of the three kingdoms to a meeting in Kalmar, where a draft for a constitution was made upon which the union was to be based, and in which the law of succession was to be incorporated.

But although she had met with but little opposition in having Erik elected king of the three countries, she seems to have found it impossible to induce the representatives at Kalmar to frame a constitution to her liking. To judge from her whole life, she had evidently contended for a strictly hereditary and unlimited monarchy, whereas Sweden and Denmark favored an elective one and their representatives succeeded in getting their ideas incorporated into the constitution. Moreover, from all the acts of her reign it is evident that she stood for the supremacy of Denmark, not for a union of three independent countries, as the constitution vouchsafed. These disagreeable elements no doubt account for the fact that Margaret never took the necessary steps to make the document valid. She seems to have let it go by default, for there is no trace of any copies of this first draft having been made for each of the countries in accordance with the stipulations of the original draft. Moreover, the document does not bear the seal of a single Norwegian representative. Miss Hill repeats the error of the older writers on this subject when she speaks of the instrument framed at Kalmar as one that became legally binding, and says: "Two exact copies of this treaty, written on parchment, were given to each kingdom, to which four prelates and thirteen gentlemen 'freely and voluntarily' placed their seals."

It is to be regretted that Miss Hill has not had access to any of the modern historians of Scandinavia. She speaks of the scantiness of her material, and it is indeed scanty when she knows only one unimportant Scandinavian writer of this century. The greater historical writers of all of the Scandinavian countries have of course discussed Margaret, but the authority on her is Professor Christian Erslev of the Copenhagen University, whose work entitled "*Dronning Margarethe og Kalmarunionens Grundlæggelse*," 1882, is a most reliable account of the great Northern queen, based on the most searching investigation of original sources. The light he casts on the dark epoch of Margaret's reign, when intellectual life was at its lowest ebb, leaves her a ruler of less heroic mould than the traditional Margaret, and detracts much from the significance of the convention at Kalmar. Meanwhile, until some one gives us in English the story of Margaret's life based on Erslev's work, we are grateful to Miss Hill for her book, which, like the old authorities on which it is based, is correct enough in dates and the superficial facts of her life, but not to be relied upon for a just and critical estimate of Margaret and her times.

JULIUS E. OLSON.

Catalogue of the Library of Syon Monastery, Isleworth. Edited by MARY BATESON, Associate and Lecturer of Newnham College, Cambridge. (Cambridge: University Press. 1898. Pp. xxx, 262.)

SYON Monastery was founded under the rule of St. Bridget in 1415 near Twickenham, was transferred to Isleworth in 1431 and was dissolved in 1539. It contained two libraries, one for monks and the other for nuns. This catalogue, which represents the monks' library, was com-